

REMARKS

Claims 20-23 and 26-29 were examined and rejected in the above-identified final Office Action. Claims 1-19 and 24-25 have been previously canceled. Applicants amend claims 20, 23, 26-28, and submit additional claims 30-36. Applicants assert that no new matter is added herein. Applicants do not cancel any claims herein. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 20-23 and 26-29, in consideration of additional claims 30-36 in view of at least the following remarks.

I. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Patent Office rejects claims 20-23 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Claim 20 recites the limitation “the doped region” in line 6, after “. . . in the second well by.” The Patent Office rejects claim 20 as having insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Applicants amend claim 20 to change “the doped region” to “the second well.” Applicants assert that claim 20 as amended complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112, and therefore, request that the Patent Office withdraw the above-noted rejection.

II. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 20-23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,500,546 to Marum et al. (Marum). To anticipate a claim, the relied upon reference must disclose every limitation of the claim.

Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the reason that the cited references do not teach the following limitations of independent claim 20. Among other elements, Claim 20 includes the first doped region as an anode of a diode, and the third doped region as a cathode of the diode. On the other hand, Marum teaches that doped regions 72 are the anode contacts of the diode and that second well 34 is the cathode of the diode, while region 71, which is not the cathode of the diode, is the third doped

region (see col. 3, lines 11-13; col. 5, lines 52-54; col. 7, lines 1-3; Figures 2A, 2B, 4, and 4A). Moreover, Ker fails to address the above-noted limitation of claim 20. Hence, Applicants respectfully request that the Patent Office withdraw the rejection above of independent claim 20.

Claims 21-23 and 26, being dependent on independent claim 20, are patentable due to their dependency.

III. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marum in view of applicants' admitted prior art. Applicants note that claims 27-29 appear to be rejected over Marum in view of Ker according to the details of the rejection. Thus, Applicants will address the details of the rejection. To render a claim obvious, all elements of that claim must be taught or suggested by at least one properly combined reference.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the above rejection for at least the reasons that the cited references do not teach or suggest the following limitations of independent claim 27. Claim 27 includes forming a first and second protection circuit and coupling the second protection circuit between the first protection circuit and the performance circuit. On the other hand, Marum teaches that circuit 70 of Figure 4 for use as a primary clamping mechanism only. (See col. 3, lines 43-56; col. 6, line 65 through col. 7, line 15.) Thus, Marum does not suggest or describe a second protection circuit occupying a second well and including a plurality of unit cells coupled between a first protection circuit and the performance circuit because Marum only teaches that circuit 70 as the primary protection circuit and not as coupled between another protection circuit and the performance circuit of Marum (see Figures 1 and 2 where secondary clamp 18 or diode 30 is second the protection circuit coupled between primary clamp 14 (e.g., circuit 70) and circuit 20). Moreover, Ker fails to address the limitation noted above. Hence, Applicants respectfully request that the Patent Office withdraw the rejection above of independent claim 27.

Claims 28-29, being dependent on rejected independent claim 27, are patentable due to their dependency.

IV. New Claims

Claim 30 includes wherein the third doped region is doped with a greater concentration of the second dopant. However, Marum teaches that second well 35 has dopant N^+ , and doped region 71 has dopant N (where doped region 71 is the third doped region and has a lesser concentration of the dopant). Moreover, Ker fails to address these limitations.

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending (1) are in proper form, (2) are neither obvious nor anticipated by the relied upon art of record, and (3) are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 11/9/04

By: 
Angelo J. Gaz, Reg. No. 45,907

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

November 9/2004
Nadya Gordon 11/9/04
Nadya Gordon Date